



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,756	03/30/2001	Bin Jin	P 275030 P10781	3871

27496 7590 10/31/2003

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP
725 S. FIGUEROA STREET
SUITE 2800
LOS ANGELES, CA 90017

EXAMINER

MOSLEHI, FARHOOD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2003

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Page

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/820,756	JIN, BIN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Farhood Moslehi	2126	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 6-12,14-17,19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Beltran (5,630,074).
4. As per claim 1, Beltran shows a system for inter-thread communications, comprising: at least one thread from a first group of threads (e.g. col. 4, lines 63-67); a first buffer for buffering a request from the at least one thread from the first group (e.g. col. 5, line 16-20); at least one thread from a second group of threads for performing an operation according to the request retrieved from the first buffer (e.g. col. 5, lines 5-27); and a second buffer for buffering a response with respect to the request, the response being generated by the at least one thread from the second group, the response being retrieved by the at least one thread from the first group (e.g. col. 5, lines 5-27).
5. As per claim 6, it is rejected for the similar reasons as stated above.
6. As per claim 10, it is rejected for the similar reasons as stated above.
7. As per claim 12, it is rejected for the similar reasons as stated above.
8. As per claim 14, it is rejected for the similar reasons as stated above.

9. As per claim 20, it is rejected for the similar reasons as stated above.
10. As per claim 2, Beltran shows a system wherein the first group of threads includes a user interface thread (e.g. cols. 3 and 4, lines 64-67 and 1-10 respectively).
11. As per claim 3, Beltran shows a system wherein the second group of threads includes a worker thread (e.g. col. 4, lines 42-54). The KERNEL is running on a thread that is working continuously in the background, i.e. a worker thread.
12. As per claim 7, it is rejected for the reasons stated in the rejections for claims 2 and 3.
13. As per claim 15, it is rejected for the reasons stated above.
14. As per claim 8, Beltran discusses a method wherein retrieving the request by a thread from the second group according to a predetermined criterion includes retrieving according to whether the thread from the second group can perform the operation requested by the request (e.g. col. 5, lines 15-20).
15. As per claim 9, it is rejected for the similar reasons as stated above.
16. As per claim 16, it is rejected for the similar reasons as stated above.
17. As per claim 17, it is rejected for the similar reasons as stated above.
18. As per claim 11, Beltran discusses a method of receiving a response with respect to the request, generated by the thread from the second group, from a second buffer after the request being packed by the packing (e.g. col. 5, lines 50-61).
19. As per claim 19, it is rejected for the similar reasons as stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. Claims 4,5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beltran in view of Kanai et al. (5,862,403) (hereinafter Kanai).

22. As per claim 4, Beltran does not specifically address the system wherein the first buffer comprises a plurality of buffer cells. Kanai discusses a system wherein a buffer comprises a plurality of buffer units (e.g. Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Beltran and Kanai in order to have buffers comprising of cell buffers.

23. As per claim 5, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.

24. Claim 13,18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beltran in view of Hirano (5,640,604).

25. As per claim 13 Beltran does not specifically show a method for generating a response with respect to the request after the processing; identifying an available buffer cell in a second buffer; and packing the response in the available buffer cell in the second buffer. Hirano shows a method for generating a response with respect to the request after the processing (e.g. col. 2, lines 55-60); identifying an available buffer cell

Art Unit: 2126

in a second buffer (e.g. col. 2, lines 57-67); and packing the response in the available buffer cell in the second buffer (e.g. col. 2, lines 57-67).

26. As per claim 18, it is rejected for the similar reasons as stated above.

27. As per claim 21, it is rejected for the similar reasons as stated above.

Conclusion

28. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent Number 5,925,098 to Freund et al.

US Patent Number 6,131,126 to Kougiouris et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farhood Moslehi whose telephone number is 703-305-8646. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-5484.

fm